

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1-27 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 16 and 19 have been amended.

Claim 1 was amended by: (i) adding in lines 7-8: "generating a non-live media stream, by utilizing the media related information, in response to a request to provide the non-live media stream to a client;" and (ii) adding in lines 9-10: "wherein the second path comprises a network link that differs from a network link of the first path.";

Claim 4 was amended by adding: "information indicative of a location of a stored media stream and wherein the generating of a non-live media stream further comprises a determination of which frames of the stored media stream to fetch from the first path.";

Claim 9 was amended by: (i) adding in line 7: "by utilizing the media related information"; and (ii) adding in line 9: "wherein the second path comprises a network link that differs from a network link of the first path";

Claim 16 was amended by: (i) adding in line 5 and 9: "via a first path"; (ii) adding in line 6 and 10: "via a second path"; and (iii) adding in line 11: "wherein the second path comprises a network link that differs from a network link of the first path"; and

Claim 19 was amended in a similar manner to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Gordon et al. (US Patent No. 7,024,678). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Gordon et al. does not teach or suggest "wherein the second path comprises a network link that differs from a network link of the first path" as recited in the amended independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 19.

Gordon illustrates, in fig.1, a data path 116 which is a network link that is used for transferring both broadcast bitstream and other bitstreams. Data path 116 is the only path used for transferring streams between Information Server 108 and Video session manager 122 (See Gordon, col.4 lines 6-10: *"The information server 108 is coupled to the video session manager 122 via data path 116, synchronization clock path 118, and control path 120. The server 108 provides data streams that are destined for consumers on path 116 and a 10 synchronization clock on path 118."*).

The Examiner argues that the first path of claim 1 is the same as *a stream containing a realtime bitstream of encoded video information* recited by Gordon and that the second path is the *storage bitstream* recited by Gordon. The Examiner, in the response to arguments, compared the two paths to two signals: *"In the first path the signal is sent to users and the second path the signal is stored in order to provide VCR function upon receiving requests from subscribers"*.

The Applicants assert that a path in a sense of a network link differs from a path in a sense of a signal or in sense of internal data flow. As for a network link path, Gordon uses the same link for both realtime and storage bitstream (116) and the information server is the only source of transmitting both encoded broadcast stream and storage stream.

Gordon et al. does not teach or suggest "retrieving media related information; generating a non-live media stream, by utilizing the media related information, in response to a request to provide the non-live media stream to a client;" as recited in amended claim 1 (and similar amendments in claims 9 and 19).

The claim was amended as to: (i) clarify that the *media related information* is information that is required for the generation of the non-live media stream (see more details in claim 4) and it is not done by the subscriber equipment 106 of Gordon, as suggested by the Examiner; (ii) clarify that the generating of a non-live media stream is performed only in response to a request of a user. Gordon, on the other hand, as quoted by the Examiner, only "recall the fast reverse stream associated with the broadcast bitstream and send, at step 518, the fast reverse stream to the requesting subscriber". Gordon means, by the term "recall": retrieving a fast forward/backward that was **previously prepared** by the time the real-time stream arrived, see column 2 lines 27-32: "*To facilitate this functionality, a video encoder that simultaneously produces an MPEG-2 compliant fast forward, fast reverse and play bitstreams from a sequence of video frames, e.g., 601-format video, as well as a real-time bitstream for real-time transmission to the user as a broadcast transmission.*" and continue with column 2 lines 52-55: "*The play, fast forward, and fast reverse bitstreams for each GOP are organized into a file and stored on the mass storage device (e.g., disk drive array) of the file server.*".

As for claim 3, the Examiner argues that the media server of the current application, is analogue to data storage 114 of Gordon. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Media server 16 is analogue to information server 108 of Gordon, with or without data storage 114 (current application, paragraph [0049]: "*Although server 16 is referred as having an internal storage unit for storing media streams and additional information, this is not necessarily so and it may be also operable to access external databases (not shown).*"). As shown in fig.1 of the current application, media server 16 is connected to network 20 and communicates with video pump 18 over the network. Data storage 114 of Gordon, on the other hand, internally communicates only with information server 108, and functions in the same manner as the internal/ external storage, of the current application, that communicates with media server 16 only.

The Examiner also compares the *bandwidth limited link*, recited by claim 3, to cable transport subsystem 104 of Gordon. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The cable transport subsystem 104 connects the subscriber to video session manager 122 (that the Examiner compared to Video pump 18 of the current application), while the *bandwidth limited link* of the current application, connects media server 16 (that should be compared to information

APPLICANT(S): Ran M, Oz
SERIAL NO.: 10/698,189
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 10

server 108 of Gordon) with video pump 122 (that should be compared and the Examiner also compared to video session manager).

Claim 3 describes more specifically the second path, and points out that it differs from the first path, not only by the network link but also by the elements through which the video stream pass, and especially, it points out that the media server participate only in the second path and not the first path.

As for claim 4, claim 4 was amended as to further define the "media related information" by adding: "information indicative of a location of a stored media stream and wherein the generating of a non-live media stream further comprises a determination of which frames of the stored media stream to fetch from the first path". The above addition explains how different types of trick-play and speed can be generated in response to a user request, which is unlike Gordon that only **recall** a previously prepared trick-play streams (which speed is obviously fixed and cannot be changed "on the fly").

The subject matter on which the amendment of claim 4 relies, can be found at least in paragraphs: [0046]-[0048], [0057], [0070] and [0079].

For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach all elements of the claim. Therefore, Gordon cannot anticipate claims **1, 9, 16** and **19**, as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claims **1, 9, 16** and **19** are allowable. Claims **2-8, 10-15, 17, 18** and **20-27** depend from claims **1, 9, 16** and **19**, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims **2-8, 10-15, 17, 18** and **20-27** are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claims **1, 9, 16** and **19** and to claims **2-8, 10-15, 17, 18** and **20-27** dependent thereon.

APPLICANT(S): Ran M, Oz
SERIAL NO.: 10/698,189
FILED: October 30, 2003
Page 11


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Oren Reches
Attorney/Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 53,506

Dated: April 2, 2009

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801